

**IN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
GREENVILLE DIVISION**

**DWIGHT MARKHAM and
EVA MARKHAM**

PLAINTIFFS

V.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:13cv00238-SA-JMV

**JOSEPH HEAD, Individually and in His
Official Capacity as a Police Officer for
the City of Greenwood, MS; et al.**

DEFENDANTS

ORDER STAYING PROCEEDINGS

Local Uniform Civil Rule 16(b)(3)(B) provides that “[f]iling . . . an immunity defense . . . motion stays the attorney conference and disclosure requirements and all discovery not related to the issue pending the court’s ruling on the motion, including any appeal.” Because a defendant has raised the issue of qualified immunity by separate motion [8],

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that the aforementioned proceedings are hereby **STAYED** pending a ruling on the immunity motion. Accordingly, Defendant’s Motion to Stay [9] is effectively granted. Defendants shall notify the undersigned within seven (7) days of a decision on the immunity defense motion and shall submit a proposed order lifting the stay.

This 12th day of December, 2013.

/s/ Jane M. Virden
U.S. Magistrate Judge